



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/807,660

03/24/2004

Jin Hong

8021-223 (SS-19132-US)

4315

22150 7590 11/09/2007  
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 WOODBURY ROAD  
WOODBURY, NY 11797

EXAMINER

MOORE, KARLA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1792

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/09/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/807,660	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HONG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Karla Moore	<b>Art Unit</b> 1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/31/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-8,10-12,14,16,17,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-8,10-12,14,16,17,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10-12, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,816,098 to Davis et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,508,883 to Tanguay

4. Davis et al. disclose a remote plasma enhanced cleaning apparatus substantially as claimed and comprising: a main process chamber (Figure 5A, 104); a load lock chamber (12) connected to the main process chamber, wherein the main process chamber comprises a staging device (105) adjacent to the loadlock chamber for loading

the silicon wafers from the load lock chamber into the process chamber and for unloading the silicon wafers from the main process chamber into the loadlock chamber; and a carrier robot (106) disposed in a center portion of the main process chamber, wherein the carrier robot rotates and moves around a center of the main process chamber and transfers silicon wafers to an adsorption assembly, an anneal assembly, and a cooling assembly, and wherein the assemblies are disposed in the main process chamber around the carrier robot and spaced apart from one another. Davis et al. disclose that a plurality of process assemblies (modules) are provided in the main chamber (column 7, rows 17-26). The process modules can be configured to be capable of adsorption (column 17, rows 46-47 and column 25, rows 36-39), annealing (column 25, rows 60-63) and/or cooling (column 19, rows 34-37) as needed. Davis et al. disclose that the number of process assemblies can be provided as needed. Two process assemblies (modules) capable of adsorption, annealing or cooling could be provided in the apparatus. The stages in each of the process modules comprise lift pins for moving the substrates upward and downward (column 17, rows 56-59).

5. Davis et al. disclose the apparatus substantially as claimed and as described above.

6. However, Davis et al. fail to explicitly teach two adsorption, annealing or cooling stages (i.e. wafer holding positions) in a single processing chamber sharing a processing space.

7. Tanguay teaches providing a wafer holder in a single processing chamber that comprises two stages for holding two wafers for the purpose of markedly enhancing

throughput capacity (abstract; column 2, rows 64 through column 3, row 4; and column 4, rows 6-21).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided two processing stages in each of the processing chambers in Davis et al. in order to provide enhanced throughput capacity as taught by Tanguay.

9. It is also noted that the courts have ruled that the mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced. In re Harza, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). In the instant case, one of ordinary skill in the art would most definitely realize that providing two stages instead of one would undoubtedly result in increased throughput. Therefore, such a provision is neither new, nor unexpected.

10. With respect to claim 3, Davis et al. disclose using a remote plasma generator (column 32, rows 19-21).

11. With respect to claims 4 and 8, the stages in each of the process modules comprise lift pins (column 17, rows 56-59).

12. With respect to claims 6 and 16, heating means are provided heating wafers on anneal stages (column 43, rows 22-31).

13. With respect to claims 7 and 17, the annealing assembly may comprise heating wires and lamps (column 43, rows 22-31).

14. With respect to claim 10, the cooling assembly comprises cooling means for cooling the silicon wafers on cooling stages (column 19, rows 34-37).

15. With respect to claim 11, the cooling means comprises a gas supply pipe for supplying a cooling gas to the chamber or to the stage (column 19, rows 34-37).

16. With respect to claim 12 and 20, Davis et al. disclose using a remote plasma generator (column 32, rows 19-21). Also disclosed are gas supply pipes for supplying a cooling gas to the chamber or to the stage (column 19, rows 34-37). Each of the other recitations is addressed above.

17. With respect to claim 14, Davis et al. disclose each of the chambers may have a first gas injection pipe (Figure 16, 250) and a second gas injection pipe (212).

### ***Response to Arguments***

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10-12, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Tanguay teaches the provision of two processing stages in a single chamber comprising a single processing space.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karla Moore whose telephone number is 571.272.1440. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 am-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571.272.1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:  
10/807,660  
Art Unit: 1792

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Karla Moore  
7 November 2007